



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1032OR-1 for Oakridge School District #76

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's clear and credible vision for reform centers on implementing a proficiency-based educational reform model devised to enable each individual student to advance based on his or her achievement and proficiency in all content areas and related Common Core State Standards subject-area skills. These aspects are strengths because they advance the program's goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1. • Applicant's vision for reform (and its systemic and replicable approaches to realizing it) targets: (1) effectiveness of teachers and principals; (2) consistency of culture and policy related to reform; (3) proficiency standards and standards-aligned curriculum supporting reform; (4) integration of performance data and technology-based supports; and (5) expanded family and community support structures and services. These aspects are strengths because they address the 4 core assurance areas, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1. • Applicant's vision for reform encompasses identifying lower-performing students early and designing and delivering appropriate interventions for them while, at the same time, offering higher-performing students enhancements and advancement appropriate to their levels of personal learning and readiness. These aspects are strengths because they contribute to offering common and individual tasks based on student academic interests, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead agency LEA is ahead of its other 3 LEA consortium-members in implementing a proficiency-based model of education. This aspect is a weakness because the differences in readiness for implementing the model will require such LEAs to make more rapid progress than the lead agency LEA in building their capacity to implement the model with similar success during the 4-year project period. • Budget detail for Project 1 indicates that two LEA consortium-members will focus on K-12 models, while two other LEA consortium-members will focus on secondary-only models. This aspect is a weakness because in its proposal narrative and supporting attachments, applicant does not adequately discuss this feature as part of its overall plan. <p>Applicant's reform vision and its approach address the specific needs of, and delivery of personalized learning environments for, both lower-performing and higher performing students (as well as students meeting but not exceeding standards) and facilitate incorporation of students' interests and input in determining curricular content and methods of instruction. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the middle of the high range for this criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant presents all required data on its participating students and participating educators. This aspect is a strength because by clearly indicating intended participants it is responsive to the selection criterion. • Applicant will serve 4,206 students (including 2,252 high-need students) and 328 educators (including 206 teachers) at 13 sites in grades K-12 in all academic subjects. This aspect is a strength because it substantiates the applicant's commitment to accomplishing comprehensive and systemic reform. <p>Weaknesses:</p>		

- Applicant states its decision to serve 13 school sites from the start of its 4-year project period, but does not describe its process of engaging its stakeholders or its rationale for reaching it. This aspect is a weakness because, by not describing the process the applicant used or will use to select its participating schools, it represents an incomplete response to the selection criterion.
- Applicant indicates that some of the schools in its 4 LEAs opted not to participate in the project. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the overall comprehensiveness and coherence of the applicant's proposed project, the extent to which its plans for LEA-level and school-level implementation are of high quality, and the extent to which its annual goals are ambitious yet achievable.
- Applicant does not describe the roles or extent of involvement of its different groups of stakeholders (e.g., teachers, administrators, parents, students) in reaching its decision to serve its selected participating sites in all core subjects from the start. This aspect is a weakness because the engagement from the start of all stakeholders in deciding which schools to serve and how best to serve them would contribute to the overall quality of the applicant's plan and to the likelihood of the project's successful implementation.

While applicant provides all required data, it does not adequately describe how it engaged its various stakeholders in determining the scope of its overall project. In addition, applicant does not provide data on the numbers of schools, students, and educators who will not participate in its project from its inception and does not explain how it was decided that they would not participate. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the lower end of the high range for this criterion.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant describes plans to disseminate its proficiency-based model for replication in other schools, other districts, and other states. This aspect is a strength because it indicates aspirations to develop and implement a model sufficiently exemplary in its responsiveness to Absolute Priority 1 and of high enough quality in its implementation and outcomes to be disseminated and replicated elsewhere.
- Applicant describes plans to create proficiency-based, student-centered, and personalized learning environments, and to eliminate existing equity gaps in areas such as students' computer access. These aspects are strengths because they advance project-specific goals, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant presents plans for extensive outreach to students, parents, families, and community stakeholders to educate them about its proficiency-based model, its expectations for college- and career-readiness, and its opportunities for personalized student learning. These aspects are strengths because they advance project-specific goals, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes a theory of change for how the comprehensive and systemic implementation of its proficiency-based model will lead to improved learning outcomes for all students regardless of differences in levels of mastery and will facilitate learning experiences that reflect students' personal needs and interests. These aspects are strengths because they advance project-specific goals, are responsive to selection criteria, and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not discuss scale-up beyond its participating schools as such, and it does not discuss how or why it has determined that its consortium members are all ready to implement its project on its proposed scale from its start. These aspects are weaknesses because the issue of scaling up is part of the selection criterion.

Overall, applicant's plan for LEA-Wide Reform and Change is of moderate quality. As a research-based and theory-driven plan for reform, it presents only a high-level goal and frequently general activities for implementing and refining its model locally then disseminating and replicating it elsewhere; it identifies persons responsible and deliverables; its timeline is more consistently indefinite and implicit than definite or explicit. Consequently, its plan presents the elements required of a higher quality plan only to a limited extent. Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant's plan expects each student to achieve personalized annual growth in reading and mathematics sufficient to achieve the scores required to meet State standards on State summative assessments. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to 2 the 4 core assurance areas and to Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant explains why some subgroups do not appear in its tables of annual goals for its performance measures. This explanation is a strength because it facilitates determining the extent to which performance measures and annual goals are ambitious yet

achievable and the extent of applicant's responsiveness to Absolute Priority 1.

- Applicant's selected annual increments of improvement appear both ambitious and achievable in most of the areas for which it plans to measure performance; as evidence — it forecasts 1%, 2%, or 3% per year gains in each LEA having the same identified subgroup at the same grade level tested in the same subject. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant presents baselines and annual goals for the closing or reduction of achievement gaps, which enable calculation and tracking of differences between a subgroup and its comparison group (e.g., with disability or with no disability) within each grade level assessed on the State summative assessment within each consortium-member LEA. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to 2 of the 4 core assurance areas and to Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant presents baselines and annual goals for graduation rates as well as for college enrollment rates. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to 2 of the 4 core assurance areas and to Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- As benchmarks for comparison, applicant does not present the State's targets for each consortium-member LEA overall or for each LEA's various student subgroups. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the extent or degree of the ambitiousness of the applicant's annual goals as compared to those the State has set for it.
- Applicant often forecasts both students overall (i.e., all students) and the identified subgroups to make the same annual gains (e.g., 3% per year for both groups) with the consequence that existing inter-group achievement gaps will not narrow or close during or after the 4-year project but will remain constant. This aspect is a significant weakness because decreasing achievement gaps across student subgroups is one of the defining focuses of Absolute Priority 1.

Applicant's annual goals are ambitious — particularly given the consortium's recent creation and its LEA members being at very different stages of pre-existing implementation of its proficiency-based educational reform model. They are also achievable (based on their forecasted annual change increments of 1%, 2% or 3%). However, the applicant has not aligned its district-level, grade-level, and subgroup-level annual goals with those the State has set for each member LEA overall or for its various student subgroups. In addition, the annual goals in the applicant's 15 performance measures — with only one exception — do not forecast the closing or reduction of intergroup achievement gaps by the end of the 4-year project or in the first year post-grant. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that the consortium's lead agency LEA has earned national recognition for having high levels of achievement by its students in a high-poverty district. This aspect is a strength because it represents evidence for the ability of an LEA at an advanced stage of implementing the applicant's proficiency-based reform model to Improve student learning outcomes by raising student achievement.
- Applicant indicates that a second consortium LEA has improved learning outcomes by significantly raising high school scores in mathematics, science, and reading. This aspect is a strength because it represents evidence for the ability of an LEA at an early stage of implementing the applicant's proficiency-based reform model to Improve student learning outcomes by raising student achievement.
- Applicant indicates that a third consortium LEA has improved learning outcomes by significantly increasing the number of students who consider, apply to, and enroll in college. This aspect is a strength because it represents evidence for the ability of an LEA at an early stage of implementing the applicant's proficiency-based reform model to Improve student learning outcomes by raising high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates.
- Applicant indicates that 4-year graduation rates for the LEA farthest along in implementing the consortium's proficiency-based reform model are higher than for other consortium-member LEAs at earlier stages of implementation (e.g., all 9th graders of 2007-08: 74% vs. 58%, 60%, and 70%). This aspect is a strength because it supports the potential for the proficiency-based model to address Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant describes no track record of success for the 4th LEA in the consortium. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining this consortium-member LEA's ability to improve student learning outcomes or close achievement gaps by raising

student achievement, or high school graduation rates, or college enrollment rates, or to make rapid yearly strides in implementing the applicant's reform model.

- Applicant does not indicate whether the schools where most evidence of a track record of success was accomplished were persistently lowest-achieving schools or low-performing schools. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not substantiate the consortium's ability to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

With the exception of one LEA, applicant's abilities to raise student achievement across each of its 4 target core content areas, to improve high school graduation rates over time, to turn around low-performing schools, and to share information with parents (among others) and engage them as active partners in its past reform efforts are generally in evidence. Overall, the foregoing considerations place the applicant at the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant provides some evidence of the overall transparency of the 4 consortium-member districts' processes, practices, and investments. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and to one of the 4 core assurance areas.
- Applicant provides evidence of one of the consortium-member districts making public, by school, its actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and to one of the 4 core assurance areas.
- Applicant provides evidence in its narrative and attachments that consortium-member LEAs make public: (1) actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the F-33 survey; (2) actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; (3) actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and (4) actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level (if available). These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant's narrative and related attachments provide inadequate evidence that every one of the 4 consortium-member LEAs is equally committed to a high level of financial transparency in its processes, practices, or investments; evidence for only one district is attached. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the lower end of the high range for this criterion.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that the State has adopted a new P-20 educational system. This aspect is a strength because seamless transition from one level of education to another – from entering preschool through completing advanced degrees – supports the defining attributes of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that a State Senate Bill 290 requires districts to implement a system for teacher and administrator evaluations and support that match individual teachers with individual students to measure effectiveness and student growth, and that requires linking the evaluation of local educators' performance to students' growth and achievement. This aspect is a strength because having more effective and highly effective teachers and principals is one of the 4 core assurance areas and a focus of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that a State House Bill 2220 requires assessments to measure student progress based on a student's proficiency in knowledge and skills. This aspect is a strength because personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards is a focus of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that the State enables students to gain credits for graduation by demonstrating proficiency through credit-for-proficiency courses. This aspect is a strength because accelerating student achievement is a focus of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that the State's 40/40/20 Initiative anticipates that by 2025, 100% of students will graduate with a rigorous high school diploma, of whom 40% will go on to earn a bachelor's degree, 40% will go on to earn an associate's degree, and 20% will go on to a career or military pursuits based on a rigorous diploma program. This aspect is a strength because increasing the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers is a focus of Absolute Priority 1.

- Applicant indicates that among the State's areas for local flexibility are: alignment of performance goals to college- and career-ready standards; focus on student outcomes; reporting of timely, actionable, and widely accessible data; continuous disaggregation of performance data by subgroups; building school and district capacity to accomplish reforms; targeting lowest performing schools in each LEA; and innovation, evaluation, and continuous improvement. These aspects are strengths because these areas support the focuses of Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not describe or cite any State statutes, regulations, or policies that provide school districts with the degree of financial flexibility, discretion, or autonomy they need to allocate and commit their financial resources in ways that will support the consortium members' plans for reform.

The State's legal, statutory, and regulatory frameworks — as described — appear compatible with the applicant's plans to address Absolute Priority 1. The one area where evidence is not cited is that of flexibility, discretion, or autonomy in the allocation and of financial resources. Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the high range for this criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant plans to use letters and meetings to educate students, families, and all community stakeholders about its proficiency-based model, its expectations for college- and career-readiness, and its schools' personalized learning opportunities. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and has the potential to support substantive stakeholder engagement.
- Applicant indicates that well over 80% of teachers in each consortium LEA support the adoption of its proficiency-based educational reform model. This aspect is a strength because it exceeds the program-required 70% threshold for teacher engagement and support.
- Applicant includes detailed letters of support from both of its partner institutions of higher education – its third-party evaluator and its developer of still-needed formative assessments – as well as from the State's leading provider of professional development in proficiency-based education, and from a regional educational services district. This aspect is a strength because the letters document meaningful stakeholder support among key external partners for implementing the proposed project.
- Applicant includes generally detailed letters of support from its 4 community mayors and city managers, 3 of its state legislators, and 2 of its executive-level state educational agency administrators. These aspects are strengths because the letters document meaningful stakeholder support at the community and State levels.
- Applicant includes generally detailed letters of support from all 4 of its school boards, 3 of its 4 educational associations, one of its 4 superintendents of schools, one of its 6 high school principals. These aspects are strengths because the letters document meaningful stakeholder support in the consortium-member LEAs.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not adequately describe how the consortium engaged students, families, teachers, and principals in each of its 13 schools in all 4 consortium LEAs in developing this specific proposal submitted at this specific time to this specific grant program; it limits detail to the lead agency LEA which is the one also most advanced in implementing a proficiency-based educational reform model. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not document the support or engagement in planning of such stakeholders as parents, parent organizations, students, or student organizations. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant includes a letter of support from only one of its 13 school principals. This aspect is a weakness because it fails to document meaningful stakeholder support from participating school principals.
- Applicant does not document the support of its teachers associations. This aspect is a significant weakness because it fails to document meaningful support from a required category of stakeholders and key participants in implementing the project.
- Applicant does not discuss whether or how or to what extent it revised its present proposal based upon engagement of its stakeholders and input or feedback from them. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to the selection criterion.

Applicant presents limited evidence that its stakeholders were directly engaged in developing the present proposal, and – significantly – it provides insufficient documentation of the support of its classroom teachers and school principals. Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- In attachments, applicant provides data on its member districts' 4-year and 5-year graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment rates, reading and mathematics proficiency (grade 3), and on-track rates (grades 6 and 9). This aspect is a strength because it contributes to the applicant's analysis of needs and gaps and is responsive to the selection criterion.
- Applicant presents some evidence of member districts' differences in all students' proficiency in reading (grade 3) in 2010-11: 88% vs. 82%, 87%, and 87%. This aspect is a strength because it contributes to the applicant's analysis of needs and gaps and is responsive to the selection criterion.
- Applicant presents some evidence of member districts' differences in all students' proficiency in mathematics (grade 3) in 2010-11: 72% vs. 46%, 64%, and 54%. This aspect is a strength because it contributes to the applicant's analysis of needs and gaps and is responsive to the selection criterion.
- Applicant presents some evidence of member districts' differences in all students being on-track for graduation (grade 6) in 2010-11: 90% vs. 86%, 87%, and 86%. This aspect is a strength because it contributes to the applicant's analysis of needs and gaps and is responsive to the selection criterion.
- Applicant presents some evidence of member districts' differences in all students being on-track for graduation (grade 9) in 2010-11: 93% vs. NA, 62%, and NA. This aspect is a strength because it contributes to the applicant's analysis of needs and gaps and is responsive to the selection criterion.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant provides extremely limited narrative discussion or analysis of the current status of its needs and gaps. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria and impedes determining the nature and extent of needs and gaps.
- For 2 LEAs, including the lead agency LEA, subgroup data are available only for disadvantaged students, while for the other 2 LEAs subgroup data are also available for racial and ethnic groups; why this is so is not stated. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the nature and extent of needs, impedes determining intergroup achievement gaps, and impedes ascertaining the extent of ambitiousness and achievability of annual goals for closing or reducing achievement gaps.

Applicant's specific plan for analyzing the current status of needs and gaps is of low to moderate quality – it mentions data analysis activities and parties responsible for data analysis, but it does not describe its goal, timelines, or deliverables specific to a plan for Analysis of Needs and Gaps. However, with the exceptions noted, applicant generally does provide adequate and comprehensive performance data for its baselines and annual goals for all 4 consortium-members. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the high end of the mid-range for this criterion.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that all consortium-member LEAs are committed to enabling all students to learn at their own pace and to advance through school based on their demonstrated proficiency in all content areas, including the Common Core State Standards. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans to implement a system of interventions for lower-performing students who are not meeting State standards as well as a system of enrichments and acceleration options for students who are demonstrating proficiency or higher levels of mastery. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its intentions to involve students in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans for enabling teachers to provide differentiated and scaffolded instruction with opportunities for interventions and acceleration for all students. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans for using professional development in differentiated instruction to enable teachers to align their teaching strategies with students' interests, learning modalities, and readiness to learn. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant identifies as its strategies for differentiation: cooperative learning, like ability grouping, jigsaw, literature circles; curriculum compacting, tiered instruction, scaffolding, parallel curriculum; systematic inventive thinking, Socratic instruction, learning centers,

task cards; learning contracts, independent projects, complex instruction, apprenticeship. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

- Applicant describes its plans for developing students' attributes related to college- and career-readiness, personalizing the sequence of instructional content and skill development, and using differentiated instructional approaches to support intervention and acceleration for all students. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes how it will ensure students are able to monitor their progress toward mastery, use online and on-site technologies and data-supported tracking to access personalized guidance for next-steps based on what they show they already know and can do of their progress and needs, and access frequently updated individual student data such as online grade-books to self-monitor progress. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant presents its plan to train its students in using an online grade-book and other tools and resources provided to them so that they can track and manage their learning. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant inadequately details its plan for providing or enhancing students' access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives; it is stated only in broad terms. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not specify or offer examples of the teaching strategies and integrated soft skills it will incorporate to ensure that develop students' capacities for goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem solving. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not describe how it will adjust its training of the full range of its students in grades K-12 in using online grade-books to self-monitor learning progress so that such use will be age-appropriate. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Considered as a whole, applicant's plan for Learning is of moderate quality — it does not state its goal, seldom identifies who will be responsible for each of its core activities, seldom identifies intended deliverables, and is seldom specific with its timelines for its core activities. Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant presents its plans to deliver a total of 25 days (Year 1: 10 days, Years 2-4: 5 days each) of in-service professional development for teachers, and to have experts in proficiency-based teaching and learning provide extensive coaching as well as support for educators via seminars. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to the 4 core assurance areas and to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans to develop new computer-accessible and online assessments to measure and provide frequent feedback on student progress in grades 9, 10, and 12 and to support developing personalized learning goals for them. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to the 4 core assurance areas and to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes how its consortium-member districts' current real-time interoperable data storage and retrieval systems make data accessible for teachers, parents, and students and function as a central hub to support data-driven decision-making throughout instruction and to support both formative and summative assessments. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes how all teachers will develop individualized professional development plans and track their personal growth and how their plans will link the teachers' performance to their students' academic growth and achievement. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that State mandates require all districts to have in place a teacher and principal evaluation system. This aspect is a strength it addresses a core assurance area and supports the applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that all educators will have access to actionable information about their students' learning progress and outcomes, and that frequent assessments and broad and deep data-capture will support continuously available feedback about educators' effectiveness in their uses of time, technology, curricular materials, and other resources in meeting students' needs. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support the applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes the use of teacher-coaches, seminars on effective teaching strategies, and in-services on delivering proficiency-based education for all student subgroups, which are all likely to promote creation of cultures of change and continuous improvement in the consortium's 13 target schools. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to the selection

criteria and support the applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant provides no specific timeline for when professional development in-service days and seminars will occur. This aspect is a weakness because a timeline is a required element of a high-quality plan.
- Applicant does not indicate when its 4 days per year of professional development by a nationally recognized expert in proficiency-based education and differentiated instruction — budgeted at a total cost of \$200,000 in Project 5 — will occur. This aspect is a weakness because a timeline is a required element of a high-quality plan.
- Applicant does not describe specifics of how teachers will adapt content and instruction to reflect differences in students' readiness, prior achievement, learning modalities, and academic interests. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not delineate its approach to evaluating effectiveness of the superintendent and does not discuss how it will develop and implement such an evaluation. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not discuss how it would improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the its teacher and principal evaluation systems. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not present a high-quality plan for its 4 consortium-member LEAs each increasing the numbers of their students who have effective and highly effective teachers and principals in the LEAs' hard-to-staff schools or hard-to-staff subjects or hard-to-staff specialty areas. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Considered as a whole, applicant's plan for Teaching and Leading is of moderate quality. Applicant identifies its responsible positions and/or partnering agencies; it describes its core activities (e.g., 25 in-service days) and key deliverables (e.g., new assessments); and, on occasion, it indicates a timeline, although only in broad terms. However, it does not state its deliverables or present a goal specific to Teaching and Leading. Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that all 13 participating schools already support proficiency-based teaching and learning in their policies and infrastructures. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant discusses where it will locate the consortium project's office and how that office will support the participating schools and consortium-member LEAs. These practices are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant indicates that its 13 participating schools and their respective school leadership teams and school boards will have flexibility and autonomy over school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions, staffing models, and school-level budgets. These practices are strengths because they facilitate implementation of strategies for achieving project-specific goals and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- All 13 participating schools have in place — or are in the process of adopting — additional scheduled time dedicated to interventions and enhancements. This practice is a strength because it facilitates implementation of strategies for achieving project-specific goals and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans for all students to have access to multiple ways to demonstrate mastery, and multiple opportunities to do so with dedicated intervention and enhancement time at all participating schools. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant cites and attaches samples of specific pertinent district-wide policies among the 4 consortium-member LEAs that ensure site-level flexibility and autonomy (e.g., for postsecondary transition supports, grading, and offering credit for proficiency) or may serve as models for governance and other aspects of the consortium as a whole. This aspect is a strength because the policies facilitate implementation of strategies for achieving project-specific goals and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Considered as a whole, applicant's plan is of moderate to high quality. Although applicant is generally responsive to other selection criteria related to LEA Policies, Practices, and Rules, it does not present a plan that responds entirely to all elements that define a

high-quality plan. Applicant specifies several core activities and identifies responsible parties (e.g., school leadership teams and teacher proficiency coaches, and educators as participants in in-services). However, applicant does not present a goal and does not discuss specific deliverables related to the overall consortium's practices, policies, and rules or to those of its 4 individual member LEAs.

Overall, the foregoing considerations place the applicant at the lower end of the high range for this criterion.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant describes its plans to keep open some of its facilities during hours outside its regular school-day hours to provide access to computers and other technologies for families and students who lack at-home access to them. These aspects are strengths because they improve equity of access in ways responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its plans to deliver appropriate levels of technical support to students, parents, educators, and others via each LEA consortium member's technology support personnel, university providers of online learning resources, staff of technology-based curriculum providers, and staff of a regional educational services agency. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes its consortium-adopted data systems that support students' educational and behavioral data and its consortium-adopted online resources that deliver media-rich content, assessments, lesson plans, individualized instruction, and comprehensive student data. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that at the level of individual students, student subgroups, or complete classes, teachers and other stakeholders can access current and historical student academic, behavior, demographics, and individual status data via the State's data warehouse. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and support applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not discuss roles of its school-level library media specialists, its school-level leadership teams, or its external partners for professional development and assessment development in providing technical support to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not discuss the extent of interoperability of the State's or its consortium members' data systems in terms of their inclusion of human resources data or budget data. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Considered as a whole, applicant's plan for LEA and School Infrastructure is of moderate to high quality. Applicant identifies responsible parties and key activities. It does not specify timelines, does not state a goal specific to LEA and School Infrastructure, and does not discuss its deliverables as such. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that the consortium's administrators will meet quarterly to revisit plans; to monitor, evaluate, and revise plans and strategies; and to review progress in implementing the project. These aspects are strengths because they facilitate timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals, represent opportunities to make mid-course and post-grant corrections, and provide means to verify continuous improvement.
- School-level leadership teams will contribute input to the continuous improvement process. This aspect is a strength because it facilitates making mid-course and post-grant corrections and engaging in continuous improvements at the school and classroom levels where many of the project's most significant strategies will be implemented.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not describe the rigor of its continuous improvement process or detail how it will make ongoing corrections and improvements during and after project implementation. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the degree of rigorousness of the continuous improvement process and ascertaining its potential usefulness in making mid-course and post-grant corrections and improvements.
- Applicant describes no mechanisms for publicly sharing information on the quality or impacts of its grant-funded investments. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant mentions no pre-existing or project-specific consortium-wide advisory bodies to guide implementation or to monitor or evaluate its progress to ensure continuous improvement. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes effective coordination and making of mid-course corrections within and across the 4 LEAs throughout the continuous improvement process.

Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that a grant-funded Grant Administrator will be responsible for ensuring communication and engagement with the project's internal and external stakeholders. This aspect is a strength because it explicitly assigns a specific responsible party to both roles, is responsive to selection criteria, and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant indicates that it intends to place information online in order to ensure public access and transparency among its stakeholders. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to the selection criterion concerning communication with both internal and external stakeholders and supports applicant's plans for Absolute Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not adequately discuss presence and roles of external stakeholders (parents and others) on school-level and district-level leadership teams. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant does not adequately describe specific strategies to ensure active or sustained or substantive engagement of its external stakeholders in the consortium's 4 geographically large districts. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to the selection criterion.

Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant proposes 15 appropriate performance measures, which number falls near the program's estimated range. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant thoroughly and consistently justifies its selections of all of its applicant-proposed performance measures with a rationale; identifies rigorous, timely, and formative information sources; and presents a theory of action for its selected applicant-proposed measures. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant forecasts the performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in Performance Measure 14 (postsecondary enrollment) to close to 0% in the first post-grant school year. This aspect is a strength because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1 and turning around lowest-achieving schools is a focus of one of the 4 core assurance areas.
- Applicant indicates that an outside evaluator will monitor and evaluate its progress in achieving its 15 performance measures, and attached budget detail for Project 7 identifies the Lead Evaluator — and two others affiliated with the university partner providing third-party evaluation — who will assist with external evaluation. These aspects are strengths because they facilitate ensuring that applicant is on-course for achieving the annual goals of its performance measures overall and for its identified subgroups as well as implementing other aspects of its project.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant's performance measures table indicates that it expects to have all participating students have highly effective teachers (100%) and highly effective principals (100%) after its 4-year project. However, applicant explains that it has used 'highly qualified' as its criterion since the State does not yet have 'highly effective' teacher measures in place. This aspect is a weakness because applicant does not indicate if the statutory (NCLBA) definition of 'highly qualified' is the same as or consistent with the statutory (ARRA) definition of 'highly effective', and it does not indicate if the State has defined 'highly effective' in any way for school districts in the State. Both considerations impede determining the quality of the applicant's plans to address one of the program's 4 core

assurance areas.

- Applicant's performance measures table indicates that it expects to have all participating students have effective teachers (100%) and effective principals (100%) every year of its 4-year project. However, applicant explains that it has used 'qualified' as its criterion since the State does not yet have 'effective' teacher measures in place. This aspect is a weakness because applicant does not indicate if the statutory (NCLBA) definition of 'qualified' is the same as or consistent with the statutory (ARRA) definition of 'effective', and it does not indicate if the State has defined 'effective' in any way for school districts in the State. Both considerations impede determining the quality of the applicant's plans to address one of the program's 4 core assurance areas.
- An attached sample of the Developmental Assets Profile indicates a self-report for ages 11-18, not that it is an instrument designed for use with grades K-3 as stated in the applicant's Performance Measure 5; how and why the measure can be used (if so) for both populations is not explained. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the quality of applicant's plans to assess grades K-3.
- Applicant provides no baseline data or annual targets for its Performance Measure 5 (K-3 Developmental Assets Profile) – applicant does not explain why they are not available. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the quality of applicant's plans to assess grades K-3.
- Applicant forecasts performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in performance measures for grade 3 to remain constant in both reading (10%) and mathematics (11%) during the entire 4-year project. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant forecasts performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in Performance Measure 7 are projected to remain constant for 6th Grade on Track (2%) during the entire 4-year project. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant does not explain why there are no subgroup data available for its Performance Measure 8 (Percentage of Students Who Complete Algebra by the End of 7th Grade). This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the quality of plans to assess reduction of achievement gaps in completing Algebra between students overall and identified subgroups.
- Applicant provides no baseline data or annual targets for its Performance Measure 9 (8th Grade Healthy Teens Survey) – applicant does not explain why they are not available. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the ambitiousness of annual performance targets overall and by subgroup for this measure.
- Applicant does not explain why there are no subgroup data available for its Performance Measure 10 (FAFSA Form). This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the ambitiousness of annual performance targets overall and by subgroup for this measure.
- Applicant forecasts performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in Performance Measure 11 are projected to remain constant for 9th Grade on Track (7%) during the entire 4-year project. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant forecasts performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in Performance Measure 12 are projected to remain constant for 11th Grade Reading (4%) during the entire 4-year project. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant forecasts performance gaps for the one identified subgroup in Performance Measure 13 are projected to remain constant for 4-year graduation rate (2%) during the entire 4-year project. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is part of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant provides no baseline data or annual targets for its Performance Measure 15 (9th-12th Grade Healthy Teens Survey) – applicant does not explain why they are not available. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the ambitiousness of annual performance targets overall and by subgroup for this measure.
- The consortium's leadership teams' roles in reviewing and improving the project's selected performance measures over time — and how they will relate to or coordinate with a proposed outside evaluator's roles — is not explicitly stated in presenting its measures. This aspect is a weakness potential lack of coordination imperils successful implementation of the project's evaluation plan and its capacity to address Absolute Priority 1.

Considered in the overall context of its proposal, the applicant's annual goals and performance targets appear ambitious yet achievable — with annual increments of change of 1%, 2%, 3%, or 4%. However, with the singular exception of Performance Measure 14, they do not clearly communicate a plan to close or reduce achievement gaps between or among subgroups present in the 4-LEA consortium's 13 participating schools. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant plans to retain a university-based teacher research institute as its third-party evaluator, and this organization refers to its experience in evaluating multi-district proficiency-based educational systems in a letter of support. These aspects are strengths because retaining an external evaluator familiar with the applicant's reform model will facilitate overall evaluation of the project's effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not otherwise discuss this sub-criterion in its proposal. It describes no plan to evaluate its project's effectiveness in terms of the effects of its uses of a total of 25 professional development in-service days, its deployment and use of on-site and online technology, its productive use of assets, its decision-making structures, or its implementation of strategies specific to its overall project. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Applicant's plan for Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments is of low to moderate quality. Although it indicates timelines, specifies core activities (for monitoring, but not evaluation), and identifies responsible parties (as partners for assessment development and for outside evaluation), it does not discuss deliverables (e.g., project-developed instruments) and it does not state any goals for Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the lower end of the mid-range for this criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant's budget appears sufficient to support its proposal. Among reasons for this determination are: requested funding subtotals for its 8 project budgets in sequence are: \$876,037, \$2,802,693.44, \$800,000, \$500,000, \$1,700,000, \$50,000, \$628,578, and \$905,537.68; and of these amounts, at least \$905,537.68 is identified as for grant administration, and another \$2,802,693.44 is identified as for district proficiency coaches. Of the \$8,262,846.12 total grant requested, \$2,004,615 (or 24.26%) is designated for three sub-contracts.
- Applicant provides detailed rationales for investing in the line items of each of its 8 project-level budgets. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria and facilitate determining whether the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable.
- In its Project Level Itemized Costs tables, applicant differentiates between its one-time investments and its ongoing operational costs. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to selection criteria.
- Applicant's salary and wage schedules and fringe benefit rates are described as reflecting local policy and the policies of its several proposed sub-contractors. These aspects are strengths because they contribute to determining the reasonableness and sufficiency of the proposed budget.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not state its consortium members' specific fringe benefits rate (or rates) or the components used in calculating it (or them). This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the reasonableness and sufficiency of the proposed budget.
- Project evaluation costs represent 7.6% of the total grant request. This aspect is a weakness because the amount of this cost appears unreasonable and unnecessary given that all program grantees will be required to participate in a national evaluation.
- Grant administration costs represent 10.96% of the total grant request and are in addition to the contracted evaluation services. In addition, a separate Grant Coordinator position is budgeted in the Project 1 sub-budget at an additional total cost to the grant program (for salary plus fringe benefits) of \$380,452 (or 4.6%) of the total grant request — based on figures in Attachment F-1 (Budget Summary); furthermore, the costs discussed in the subsequent budget justification narrative — which names only one position title (a Grant Administrator) to be compensated in the sub-contract — are inconsistent with the costs identified on this Budget Summary. These aspects are weaknesses because they impede determination of the reasonableness of the share of the budget intended to support project administration.
- Applicant indicates at (C)(2) that it will take a university partner a total of 9 months to develop new high school assessments for grades 9, 10, and 12 — but its Project 4 budget assigns costs to all 4 project-years (Year 1: \$200,000, Years 2-4: \$100,000 per year). These aspects are weaknesses because the requested yearly amounts appear unreasonable if the stated 9-month timeline for developing proposed new assessments is accurate.
- Although the Overall Budget Summary appears to request no grant funds for the cost categories of travel, equipment, supplies, training stipends, and indirect costs, such costs are in fact built into and requested for the 3 sub-contracts (Project 1, Project 4, Project 7). This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the reasonableness and sufficiency of the overall budget.
- Applicant misidentifies contractual licensing agreements with one or more providers of hybrid learning software (Project 3) as one-time rather than recurring (or ongoing) costs. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to the selection criteria
- Applicant never adequately explains the specifics of what it intends to implement as 'hybrid learning environments' — but it indicates that its schools will explore how to introduce them to existing class instruction, and it budgets \$800,000 (or 9.86% of its total grant

request) as its Project 3 for this purpose. This aspect is a weakness because the requested yearly amounts appear unreasonable if schools are only going to explore the use of hybrid learning environments in their classrooms.

- Applicant does not identify any other sources of funds that will support its project; it does not cite some sources of funding (e.g., IDEA Part B, NCLBA Titles IA and IIA, and others), which can readily be coordinated with, and used to leverage, its requested ARRA grant funds. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to the selection criterion.

Overall, these considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that it expects that its proficiency-based educational model for grades K-12 will be sustainable long-term with what it calls 'normally available' funds. This aspect is a weakness because the applicant does not specify by name or nature what funding sources it anticipates will be normally available after the 4-year project period.
- Applicant plans to disseminate its model within the State and nationally by hosting site visits, posting on 2 blogs, sharing resources on a website, presenting at conferences and national advisory board meetings, and using print, audiovisuals, and other communications media. These aspects are strengths because they reflect a working premise that the costs of adopting and implementing the applicant's model with fidelity in other school districts will be sufficiently reasonable as to permit widespread replication.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant's narrative expresses an intention to continue to work together as a consortium, yet its Memorandum of Understanding states that the consortium will terminate at the end of the 4-year project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever comes first. These aspects are weakness because they imperil the post-grant sustainability of the consortium and its project.
- Applicant does not discuss which grant-funded positions, practices, policies, or processes it expects to continue after the 4-year project period or how it plans to select which ones to sustain financially. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the reasonableness and sufficiency of resources for, and consortium-members' commitments to, sustaining the project in the post-grant period.
- Applicant does not specify which such funding sources it plans to continue to use to support its model after the 4-year project period, and does not identify any alternate funding sources suitable for use during the post-grant period. This aspect is a weakness because it impedes determining the sufficiency of resources available to sustain the project in the post-grant period.
- Applicant does not describe the roles of State and local government leaders in providing financial support or other resources during the post-grant period; none of the attached letters from State and local governments commits any future financial support. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.
- Applicant evidences concern about sustainability of its strategies, but does not present a detailed and compelling set of budgetary strategies for ensuring sustainability. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to selection criteria.

Considered as a whole, applicant's plan for Sustainability is of low to moderate quality. Applicant does not provide specifics about its potential sources of post-grant funding; it also provides no plans to commit existing funding resources (e.g., NCLBA Titles IA, IIA, IIB) ordinarily available to high-poverty school districts to sustaining its strategies after grant funding. In addition, applicant's discussion of Sustainability is incompletely responsive to selection criteria in that it indicates activities and responsible parties, but does not describe a related goal, timelines, or deliverables. Overall, these considerations place the applicant at the middle of the mid-range for this criterion.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Applicant indicates that through an existing Family Resource Center, it plans to partner with local and area public and private sector organizations in ways designed to support its plans for Absolute Priority 1; that its lead LEA plans to partner with 6 identified organizations while a second LEA plans to partner with 2 identified organizations; and that the plans build on existing partnerships in both LEAs. These aspects are strengths because they support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant plans to augment its schools' resources, supplement its student and family supports, and address social, emotional, and

behavioral needs of an unspecified number of high-need students and their families in both LEAs. These aspects are strengths because they support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1

- Applicant identifies 5 population-level desired results related to its ongoing public and private resource partnerships — 3 focus on educational results, one focuses on family and community results, and one focuses on both educational and family and community results. These aspects are strengths because they support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant describes the resources it will use to track its 5 indicators for participating students and to match them against an aggregate of all students in the consortium. These aspects are strengths because they are responsive to Competitive Priority selection criteria.
- In its partnership-based activities, applicant plans to focus its resources on high-need students, particularly those who face special challenges (e.g., disabilities, homelessness, poverty). This aspect is a strength because it supports the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant plans to scale up its model – by disseminating it to leadership teams of other schools within its 4 consortium-member LEAs – which have not yet signed on to the consortium’s proposed project – and to State databases where it will be accessible to leadership teams across the State. This aspect is a strength because it supports the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant identifies the multiple mechanisms that its 4 LEA consortium-members will use to engage parents/families in decision-making and in identifying student, family, and school needs. This aspect is a strength because it is responsive to Competitive Priority selection criteria.

Weaknesses:

- Applicant does not detail plans for 2 of its 4 consortium-member LEAs to partner with local and area public and private sector organizations in ways designed to support its plans for Absolute Priority 1 – and presents no evidence that they already do so. This aspect is a weakness because it does not support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant does not describe the complementarity of its partnerships with its regular day services at its 4 districts’ 13 schools sites or with documented needs of participating students/families. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to Competitive Priority selection criteria.
- Performance measures for the applicant’s 5 Competitive Priority indicators provide baselines and targets for only 3 of the 5 measures. This aspect is a weakness because it represents an incomplete response to Competitive Priority selection criteria.
- For each of the 3 indicators for which there are baselines and goals, the same size gaps between the identified subgroup and all participating students will remain at the end of and after the 4-year project period (10%, 7%, and 2%) as before its start. This aspect is a weakness because closing or reducing achievement gaps is a focus of Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant’s performance measures are likely to be achievable, but they are not ambitious in terms of closing achievement gaps over time. This aspect is a weakness because the gaps between the identified subgroup and all participating students remain constant for the annual goals and are neither closed nor reduced in ways that support Absolute Priority 1.
- Applicant does not adequately describe how the consortium and its partners will build staff capacity to assess students’ needs and assets; identify and inventory school and community needs and assets; or create the means to select, implement, and evaluate appropriate supports for participating students. These aspects are weaknesses because they represent incomplete responses to Competitive Priority selection criteria.

While the consortium’s Competitive Priority activities, as proposed, will support the plans described in Absolute Priority 1, the applicant does not respond explicitly to Competitive Priority selection criteria regarding: (1) staff capacity to assess students’ needs and assets, (2) inventorying school and community needs and assets, (3) selecting and using appropriate supports for students, (4) stakeholder engagement, and (5) assessing its progress in implementing its plan. It also does not address using performance data to target its resources or tracking its 5 performance indicators over time. In addition, several of its indicators repeat the same limitations as in its plans described in Absolute Priority 1.

Considered as a whole the applicant’s plan for its Competitive Priority is of moderate quality. It specifies 5 program indicators, describes core activities, provides a timeline (but only for administrative team meetings), and identifies responsible parties for its partnership-based interventions. It does not state a goal or discuss its deliverables as such. Overall, the foregoing considerations place the applicant toward the higher end of the mid-range for this criterion.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:
Strengths:

- Applicant's overall plan is comprehensive in terms of its scope — as evidenced by its proposing 8 project budgets, as well as by its targeting all grades and all core subjects in its 4 LEA consortium-members.
- Applicant's overall plan is also comprehensive — as evidenced by its proposing strategies that address all of the 4 core assurance areas (standards and assessments, data systems, effective teachers and principals, turning around lowest-achieving schools).
- Considered as a whole, applicant's plan generally is also coherent. It is also responsive to Absolute Priority 1 — as evidenced by focusing its goals and strategies as well as its requested funding on — creating personalized learning environments; personalizing strategies for both teaching and learning; significantly improving learning outcomes overall and for identified subgroups; aligning instruction, curricula, assessment, and professional development with college- and career-ready standards; promoting accelerated learning and achievement for all students and providing extensive supports and interventions for high-need students who are not demonstrating mastery of content and skills; increasing the effectiveness of educators through extensive and intensive professional development as well as data-driven assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of its classroom- and student-level impacts; expanding the numbers and ratios of students in all schools with access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals; increasing graduation rates as well as postsecondary enrollments; and improving students' college- and career-readiness.

Weaknesses:

- The coherence of the applicant's plan is incomplete in 3 significant respects: (1) the consortium will not be serving all schools or all students or all educators in its 4 LEA consortium-members, (2) the consortium is new and ad hoc to this specific grant opportunity, and (3) the consortium lacks a consortium-wide 4-year track record of success in implementing comprehensive school reform.
- The applicant's plans partially but incompletely address Absolute Priority 1 in terms of the incompleteness of the articulation of explicit and specific goals for the consortium's 8 identified projects, and in the limited extent to which performance targets and annual goals contribute to decreasing achievement gaps across all student groups in 14 of the 15 performance measures proposed to address the Absolute Priority.

Overall, in light of the foregoing considerations, the applicant has met Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	143
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1032OR-2 for Oakridge School District #76

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The development of the applicant's reform project is comprehensive and coherent. The project (The Proficiency-based education model) is based on the cumulative changes and improvement that the applicant accomplished in cooperation with institutions and agencies. It focuses on enhancing students' achievement and proficiency and on building and using a systematic data system in relation to the Common Core State Standards and college- and career-ready standards. For a systematic implementation, the application delineates three levels of implementation, which explains the current status of implementation and future directions. The applicant has also identified five components for creating a personalized learning environment. The applicant states that it will encourage "the pursuit of personal academic interests while ensuring college and career-readiness." The connection between the pursuit of personal interests and college/career-readiness is missing in this section but is addressed in a later section: Section (C)(1)(a)(iii) describes the process of identifying and incorporating "student academic interests" in the proficiency-based education model. To secure effective teachers, the applicant will provide summer training (10 days initially, and five days thereafter) and will use "data-driven evaluations of teacher, principal, and superintendent effectiveness". One of the

core educational assurance areas, namely "turning around lowest achieving schools," is not explicitly addressed in the narrative. Although it can be inferred from the description that the proposed model can improve students' achievement in lowest achieving schools, achieving this goal may require more than instructional reform. Therefore, 9 points are given to the application for this standard.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application describes the process of selecting school districts and ensuring their determination to participate. Utilizing the demonstrated success by the leading school district and the "incremental successes with limited implementation" of the proficiency-based model by three school districts indicate that the proposed project will be a continuation from what the school districts have done. These indicators also suggest that the parties are capable of implementing the project, which contributes to the credibility of the project. The application also clearly specifies participating school districts and the numbers of participating students along with students from low-income families and high-need students. The percentages of the low-income population (6-14%) appear to be low as compared to typical high-need districts. Meeting the eligibility requirements is briefly described in (A)(1) and specified. In the table for (A)(2), the percentages for Column H are miscalculated, which can be easily recalculated from the numbers given. This calculation errors were not considered toward the scoring because it is not directly related to any standards.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The reform model focuses on five clearly delineated "components of change," which constitute the framework of the Proficiency-Based Model: (a) developing effective teachers and principals by inservices and coaches, evaluated in compliance with the state statute, (b) developing consistent culture and policy conducive to the implementation of the project, (c) aligning curriculum to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), (d) using data systems supported by technology, and (e) securing family and community support. The focus is to align teaching with students' achievement and progress and the CCSS, which will personalize students' learning and will differentiate instruction to optimize the learning of individual students. The applicant incorporates successful practices from within and outside the districts (i.e., from the implementation of the model in the leading district and from Adams 50 school district in Westminster, Colorado) into the applicant's "Consistent Culture and Policy." Although using practices that were successful in the past does not automatically guarantee future success, it is the safest way as compared to practices that are not supported by such successful databases. The application includes a clear plan on using data and technology (e.g., an interoperable data warehouse, Pentamotion, and Jupiter Grades) for improvement and decision making and family/community engagement. The proposed teacher and administrator evaluation focuses on teaching effectiveness and student growth with the purposes of "closing achievement gaps, improving instruction in the classroom, and accelerating optimal growth" for all students. Thus, this model presents a comprehensively and coherently defined framework for high-quality education reform.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The baseline and annual goals on summative assessments are clearly displayed across schools. The applicant's achievement gap analysis shows that the greatest gaps occur between students with disabilities and students without disabilities, which suggests the need for more individualized support for students with disabilities. More ambitious goals for graduation are needed with higher graduation percentages at the conclusion and the "post-grant" years. The baseline percentages of college enrollment are pretty high although the baseline report includes some "n/a" data. Therefore, the projected goals by the end of the project seem achievable.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The leading district received national recognition for "having high achievement by its students for a poverty district." It

has achieved remarkable success on its 10 grade reading between 1998 and 2006. The consortium's largest school district also showed remarkable achievements in math, science, and reading over the past 10 years. Data on closing achievement gaps are not presented. The application does not include how the performance data were made available and how the data were used for instructional reform.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application reports two districts' diverse efforts to make the information regarding expenditures available to the public. The leading district publicized "four specific categories of expenditures". The Three Rivers district made "all categories" (i.e., salaries, PERS, PERS DS, FICA, WC, Insurance, and total salary and benefit) available to the public. The transparency of the Three Rivers district is demonstrated as a sample. More detailed and expanded demonstration is needed for other districts.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's project goals are well aligned with the state goals policies. The state's "outcomes-based" policies are consistent with the applicant's approach of "proficiency-based" education. The state's ESEA Waiver ensures autonomy and flexibility as well as accountability. Thus, the applicant demonstrates optimum conditions for the program implementation. No adverse conditions are reported.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has secured agreement and consensus from stakeholders to support the proficiency-based education model and the grant project. Letters from diverse stakeholders also show this support. Such agreements from families and students are not explained or demonstrated. Whether the process of development and revision of the proposal engaged stakeholders is not clear. Thus, the supporting evidence that the applicant presents is not sufficient to demonstrate the engagement of the stakeholders in the development of the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant candidly analyzed the current conditions for the implementation of the proficiency-based model with demonstrated advances (i.e., the implementation in the leading school district) and "gaps" (i.e., fully aligning the curriculum in all areas and integrating proficiency into policy and culture in some school districts). The needs for curriculum alignment and for integrating the model into policies and "culture" are identified and discussed. The analysis can assist the applicant for future improvement.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a high-quality plan (according to the criteria for "high-quality plan" of Race to the Top) to support learning through the proficiency-based instruction model and differentiated instruction. It includes tailoring instructional practices depending on the assessment on students' proficiency levels and instructional needs, ranging from interventions to acceleration. The "personalized 7-12 learning plan" assesses students' career interests and will implement a rigorous diploma with an emphasis on career and college readiness. The proposed personalized career planning will also contribute to personalizing the learning environment. The proficiency-based model strives to achieve standards to proficiency including Common Core State Standards and college- and career-ready standards, focusing on "differentiation of instruction based on content, product, aligning teaching strategies with student interest, learning modalities, and learning readiness". Differentiation also guides the use of instructional strategies to meet students'

individual needs as the applicant states, "Differentiation advocates a wide variety of instructional strategies to personalize the learning environment." Students' advancement is based on their mastery or proficiency rather than the amount of time. With firm mastery of standards, students are likely to engage in deep learning experiences. Teachers will be trained through inservice training (10 days initially and 5 days thereafter each year) to implement the proficiency-based model. The use of coaches further ensures the fidelity of the instructional model. High-needs students will receive "interventions and enhancements according to need, interest, and readiness," which means that personalized learning will occur for them. Students will be trained to use the data system that shows their progress in learning. The applicant demonstrates its preparation of this section in response to all the standards in this section (item-by-item responses), which shows that the application meets (or attempts to meet) all the criteria for this section. This section of the application does not describe any plan for "recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most" although this is explained in other sections.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that the application meets all the criteria in this section by responding item by item with the titles and numbers of the criteria. Throughout the statements, the applicant attempts to ensure the fidelity of implementing the proficiency-based model. A highly intensive, 10-day in-service training (and five days of training in subsequent years) for teachers, focusing on the instructional approach that combines proficiency-based instruction and differentiated instruction. Teacher-coaches will provide ongoing assistance. Teachers and principals will also receive feedback regarding their implementation status and will be evaluated by the teacher and administrator evaluation system in compliance to the state Senate Bill. The application also includes using a professionally developed assessment system with technical soundness developed by Behavioral Research and Teaching (BRT). With the highly continuous plan that includes these methods (i.e., assessment-->instructional methods tailored to the needs-->delivery of instruction with fidelity-->evaluation), the proposed project is likely to be implemented with high fidelity and likely to produce significant learning outcomes. The application's only weakness is its lack of timeline toward the "high quality plan" criteria.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
In this section, as in earlier sections, the applicant presents detailed plans in response to each and every criterion in the section. The plan for the grant project governance structure and facilities appears to be formed in order to implement the project with leadership autonomy and flexibility as each participating school and leadership team will "retain their authority and flexibility within the implementation plan". The proficiency-based model focuses on the mastery of students' learning for individual standards, which the students will display in multiple ways and at multiple times. This approach of differentiation truly personalizes students' learning because instructional strategies are designed or selected based on individual students' "learning modalities, student interest, and learning readiness". The application assures that "learning resources and instructional practices are adaptable and fully accessible to students with disabilities and English language learners. Also, providing sufficient opportunities to reach proficiency will benefit students with disabilities as well as English language learners. The model also allows students to advance based on their mastery of standards rather than the amount of time they spend on topics. Considering all the standards in this section, the applicant has a strong support system to implement the project. As "timeline" is not applicable for this section toward the "high quality plan" criteria, the application meets all the criteria for a high-quality plan.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
Through this criterion-by-criterion statement, the applicant plans to provide alternative ways for students and parents to access diverse educational materials conveniently. Community resources such as community libraries will be used to provide such access to materials and data. "Open format data systems" will also make instructional materials available as well as information regarding students' educational performance and behavior. The applicant also intends to maintain and update interoperable data systems that allow "exchanging data". The applicant's plan does not include any systems "that allow parents and students to export their information" (D)(2)(c). Thus the information sharing seems		

to be one way instead of both ways. This concern places the applicant's plan at the level of 9 points.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To monitor the progress of the implementation of the Proficiency-Based Model, the applicant plans to use the state assessment system and the assessment systems that two universities have developed to supplement the weaknesses of the state assessment system. In addition, teachers and "proficiency coaches" will collect quantitative and qualitative data for administrators to use for ongoing modifications and improvements. These modifications and improvements will be used through the annual summer in-services for teachers. Administrators from Consortium districts will meet "quarterly" to discuss the progress and needed modifications. Thus, this monitoring and improvement system is continuous. Perhaps the applicant's plan to use and develop assessment systems is the application's biggest strength. The only weakness toward the "high quality plan" criteria is the lack of description regarding how often the assessments will be used (i.e., the timeline) although the timeline for the administrators' meetings is specified.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant will create a Grant Administrator position who will "facilitate" the implementation of the project, communication with stakeholders, and collaborate with them. School leadership teams and "online postings" will also be used for communication and engagement. Considering this statement and earlier statements, the applicant seems to have multiple strategies for communication and engagement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided rationale for all measures, explained how they provide valid information. For some measures, the applicant provides information regarding who will evaluate and monitor the measures (i.e., the TRI at Western Oregon University). All the required measures are included. The annual targets include percentages that increase across years by varying degrees (1-3% annual increase). To be "ambitious but achievable," the degrees of annual increase should be determined by examining the nature of each goal rather than "across the board". No rationale regarding the size of increase is provided. Therefore, 4 points are given to this section.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant will evaluate how the investments are effectively used by examining the progress on the performance measures. The applicant is expecting "dramatic changes" on those measures. However, on measures that will produce percentages, the size of the projected annual increase is so small (1-3%). If a projected increase occurs (e.g., 1% increase on the postsecondary enrollment for all 12th grade participating students), the target is reached, but it's difficult to say it's a "dramatic change". In other words, the goal is not sufficiently ambitious. Also, nine of the performance measures do not have baseline data. Therefore, "dramatic changes" cannot be determined on those measures. Because of these weaknesses, the score on this section falls at the higher middle (3 points).</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) As the selection criterion requires, the application specifies overall categorical costs as well as costs by projects. Budget</p>		

Subparts 2 and 4 provide rationale for the costs.

(b) Generally, the costs are reasonably calculated. However, the lengthy first-year in-service time (10 days) does not appear necessary because the Proficiency Coaches' ongoing assistance would augment a shorter training.

(c)(i) The descriptions and tables provide detailed expenditures and their rationale. The costs are reasonably calculated according to the needs of the project and year-to-year expenses.

(c) (ii) One-time costs and ongoing costs are separated and indicated. The \$800,000 cost for licenses for hybrid learning software includes combined one-time costs and ongoing costs. Thus, all the costs are properly explained.

Because of the possibly overestimated cost specified in the above (b), 9 points are given.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will make the proficiency model sustainable "with normally available funds," meaning that the sustainability of the project will not depend on ongoing funding. The operation of the "normally available funds" for the sustainability is not clearly detailed. Also, the "ongoing minimal level of coaching" is not likely to maintain the high level of teacher quality for the Proficiency-Based Model after many years. This lack of clarity places this section at the middle of the medium level.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) The lead school district has "coherent and sustaining" relationships with community organizations to support the Proficiency-Based model directly and indirectly. Organized partnerships in other school districts are not specifically explained.

(2) The application identifies five desired results by students' grade levels. Specific quantitative data are not included.

(3) The applicant will use some of its performance measures to track the progress. The applicant will explore new partnerships based on the data on the measures.

(4) The applicant expresses the plan to use partnerships to solve problems between education and other services. The partnerships with four specific agencies are discussed.

(5) Involvement of parents and families will be facilitated by community forums.

(6) Reasonable performance goals are identified. The goals are attainable, but not "ambitious" (e.g., 3% increases annually).

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The proficiency-based model strives to achieve mastery of standards by all students by using personalized learning environments with differentiated instructional strategies based on needs, interests, and "learning modalities". To achieve this mastery, the applicant will provide differentiated instruction by adapting instructional practices based on the needs and progress of students' learning. Thus, the approach provides personalized learning environments with academic rigor. It allows students to use multiple ways to access the material and multiple ways to express their learning. All these features contribute to the first two criteria for Core Educational Assurance areas. Because the instructional strategies are aligned with students' needs, this personalized learning environment will accommodate the learning needs of students with disabilities and other high-need students. The assessment system and data system that the applicant proposes are professionally developed in collaboration with universities in the state. The data on

students' achievement and the progress of the project implementation will be monitored and used for improvement. Thus, the application meets all the Core Educational Assurance areas. My only concern is that the applicant's projected goals are not really ambitious or challenging. The applicant uses 1-3% annual increase for most goals. This seems unreasonable especially for graduation rates.

Total	210	183
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1032OR-3 for Oakridge School District #76

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has specified a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in a multifaceted plan, changing the face of education, creating a personalized learning environment, accelerating student achievement across the board and deepening student learning with individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.</p> <p>The vision of the plan's proficiency-based teaching and learning improvements are stated to be implemented for anticipated system change. The innovative challenges will occur by advancing students solely on the basis of achievement and proficiency in all content areas and moving teachers towards a data backed, proficiency based model of education.</p> <p>The WOPC describes the three distinct levels for approaching the implementation of the proficiency-based model, which will provide personalized support in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interest. This model is expected at the end of four years, will bring all participating schools to the level with drastic improvement in student achievement. The applicant has also identified five components that will directly impact the learning environment and will affect student outcomes. These five components are expected to occur in a systemic, sustainable and replicable plan to overhaul the education system, turning around their low performing schools and accelerating progress in all schools for all students.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant partnered with the school district to locate schools that were selected for participation. The selections was made from schools already experimenting with the proficiency model, three that had some incremental successes with limited implementation of a proficiency model, and schools determined to have interest, eligibility, feasibility and community supports for wide scale education reform based on the proficiency model. Additional information can further explain how the process to select participating schools was implemented and ensures that the project will target struggling students. The plan lacks profile data which could further validate the needs of the targeted population and their risk factors identifies participants are from low-income families and who are high-need students. Risk factors such as, educational levels, receives federal assistance, living in poverty, percentages of unemployment, or teachers unprepared to stimulate academic environments, etc., would further validate a high-quality LEA level and school level implementation proposal.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes a reform plan with a five prong component design for the capacity building of its participating districts, and is expected to produce systematic and sustainable student-centered learning environments. The presented plan is based on: relationships between teachers and students; the structure of classes and educational setting; teaching strategies and curriculum; educator evaluations to measure effectiveness and student growth; integrating proficiency assessments; analyzing data to create differentiated instruction; family and community support. Based on these components, the applicant anticipates having the districts committed to a model in which all students learn at their achievement level and advance based on their proficiency in all content areas.

The plan includes sparse elements in the program for ensuring system change results or improvements. Activities that demonstrates effective results were not clearly identified regarding reform support district-wide changes beyond the participating schools; the progress for all participating districts to reach its outcomes; increased teacher accountability and driven learning opportunities; students academic performance improvement; implemented activities to ensure personalized learning opportunities for the targeted population.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The WOPC model is expected to achieve effective personalized growth in reading and math for each student on state mandated summative assessments, decrease achievement gaps, and improve college enrollment rates. The participating district is expected to ensure this measurable growth based on each Achievement Compact, which is a binding agreement between the state and the district. The plan is using evidence based data from each district, showing performances on summative assessments, proficiency status, baselines and expected growth. The data for some subgroups are insufficient to determine proficiency assessment status or expected growth. Additional information can further validate if the applicant's vision is demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals. The plan lacks evidence that explains the use of data from each consortium member's Achievement Compact to ensure measurable and achievable growth for the targeted population; decreased achievement gaps for participants based on the baselines and goals; improved graduation rates with a positive correlation to each consortium member district's state required Achievement compact; the goal that by 2025 100% of adult Oregonians will earn a high school diploma or equivalent; and there will be a 40% increased towards college enrollment. It is also vague how the teacher training by coaches will use tracking data to ensure if goals are achievable for lowering achievement gaps through personalized learning and a focus on proficiency.

The applicant failed to clearly provide details likely to result in improved student learning, performance and increased equity as requested in the criterion. Additional details relative to program benchmarks that targets ambitious yet achievable annual goals, would strengthen this section in the proposal narrative.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant briefly referenced in their reform plan, the actions that demonstrates recognition of the achievement by district students from a high poverty district, addition of AP courses, and increased college enrollment. Including information such as: living below the poverty levels, receiving Federal assistance, high-needs, and numbers receiving free-lunches, would further validate needed reform. The plan did not adequately describe a clear four year record of success in advancing student learning and achievement, evidence of improved student learning outcomes and closing the achievement gaps. The plan could have included information such as: students who have average gains in English or math proficiency or increases from one year to the next in levels of proficiency in reading and math, which validates improved performance data. Their described ambitious and significant reforms for improving low-performing schools or making student performance data available, in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services, is undocumented with actual validated narratives, charts, graphs, raw data, etc., or other evidence that demonstrates evidence.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant adequately made available specific categories showing a high level of transparency in budget funds requested to cover personnel salaries to be paid to school level employees, in addition to school-level expenditures for k-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support and administration. The budget plan also transparently shows requested funds to cover LEA processes, practices and investments which meet RTTT criteria in the appendix. The plan lacks break-down descriptions of the budget categories of school level expenditures requested in the proposal, which does not meet the increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices and investment. An example would be: Textbooks, educational books and materials for (12) coaches and coordinators - estimated \$2,250 year....requested budget funds for 5 years is \$27,000.00, which shows transparency of this investment.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has put forth expectations for measuring student growth and is requiring that portions depend on teacher and principal evaluations, alignment of performance goals of college and career ready standards, mandated alignments with the Common Core State Standards, diploma requirements, and the binding district Achievement Compacts. The plan is aligned with the states identified key areas of effectiveness for ensuring implementation and continuous improved interventions targeting achievement gaps, student growth and academic improvement. Examples of some of these areas includes the adoption of the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and math, with other subjects soon to follow; alignment of performance goals to college and career ready standards; focus on student outcomes; reporting of timely, actionable and accessible data; deeper diagnostic reviews; targeting lowest performing schools; and innovation, evaluation, and continuous improvement.

The plan lacks sufficient evidence demonstrating a defined connection to the implementation of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy for ensured implementation of personalized learning environments. More evidence demonstrating successful learning environments can be included and can show support from the use of the statewide teacher and principal evaluation system; state leadership and education policy requirements; career and college readiness; state instructional targets; processes for adopting instructional materials. The plan lacks information defining the connections between the student learning growth and the WOPC identified tools (teaching and learning; staff effectiveness; family and community support; district and school structure and culture; technical and adaptive leadership). Additional information could further identify the correlation for ensured implementation and continuous improvement with the use of their leadership coaches, regional network coordinators, school appraisal teams, support teams, and education partners and organizations. The plan did not clearly demonstrate with evidence, prior records of success and conditions for reform aligning with existing state goals and statutes.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has indicated that there is community support for full implementation of proficiency-based education. There is also district wide unanimous support for the elimination of social promotion and the adoption of proficiency based education by 80% of the teachers. The plan includes a plethora of support and comment letters from school leaders and community partners. It is not evident however, that the applicant has engaged varied stakeholders, including students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools in the development of the proposal and engaging their feedback for the projects support. The plan lacks evidence and detailed information regarding stakeholders (students; parent; community partners), engagement and support which can strengthen this section.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The WOPC indicates that each participating school district has made different levels of progress towards establishing a strategic and systemic proficiency-based model. Each school has documents being at different points of implementing a curriculum aligned with proficiency standards that is reflected in the classroom, grading structure, and school policy relating to implementation of proficiency-based education. It is not evident that WOPC has made substantial progress in developing a high-quality plan for implementing personalized learning environments. The plan states that districts have implemented curriculum aligned with proficiency standards that is reflected in the classroom, instituted proficiency based policies and culture, dedicated interventions, and enhancement periods. However, it is unclear if there are goals, activities, timelines, or expected outcomes to ensure the successful implementation of a high-quality plan focusing on identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates putting forth expectations to fully implement a proficiency model based on achievement in common academic areas. These changes are specified to include a standard-based curriculum; reinvented grading policies and practices; focuses on retention and differentiated instruction; communication with student and their parents; course acceleration; and assessment of quantitative data linking teacher's performance to student outcomes.</p> <p>The plan lacks detailed information regarding a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment , in order to provide all students the support to graduate college and career ready, be included to strengthen this section. There is little clarity and details about specifics mentioned in the plan such as: scaffold instructions; parent teacher conferences; online proficiency tracking; personal learning goals; teacher professional development; proficiency levels; diverse cultures and perspectives; integration of data feedback and assessments for ongoing and regular feedback. Providing more details to connect the criterion relating to approaches to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner and the strategies for ensuring the support of parents and educators to ensure that each students has access to resources needed as specified in this section. The plan offers insufficient means for ongoing and regular feedback data to assist in determining progress toward college and career readiness; measuring success in learning content areas; results from instructional approaches; and managing support, use of tools and resources.</p> <p>The quality of the plan would be strengthened with the addition of details by which the applicant approaches strategies for provided training and support for high-need students, to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college and career standards or college and career ready graduation requirements.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that teachers in the consortium are already beginning to use proficiency and differentiation toward full implementation of a proficiency based curriculum, and supporting personalized learning environments. The plan presents that teachers are expecting to receive detailed instruction and coaching on how to engage high quality instructional strategies in their teaching. The strategies used for teacher focused professional development to ensure ongoing improvement and progress could be further discussed in the narrative. The limited number (5) in-service days per year may not be sufficient to ensure adequate professional development and the intended academic improvement results toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The processes of implementing assessments to measure student progress is detailed in the plan and is expected to provide necessary data for developing personalized learning goals. Teachers are expected to receive training which focuses on how to use data to accelerate student progress, identify risk and achievement gaps, and how to implement effective interventions within their classes. Using the common instructional strategies are expected to enable teachers to measure performance, track student progress and provide appropriate options and constructed responses. There is a lack of specific details on: the training that teachers will complete in the use of the common database software to ensure reliability and alignment for the uniformity scoring of the selected response measures; participating school leaders and leadership teams training, policies, tools, data, and resources enabling them to structure an effective learning environment; a high-level plan for increasing student instructions from highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools and specialty subjects/classrooms.</p> <p>There is a broad generalization about a teacher and principal evaluation system that links teacher evaluations to student performance, and will provide feedback for continuous improvement. It is unclear of the use of the statewide instructional improvement system for self-directed professional development, which will be beneficial to all educators if proper training on the portal is included. The plan does not give attention to the self-evaluation workbook identified as teacher's skill levels are relative to these critical elements. It is not clear how the teacher evaluative tools relates to accelerating a student's progress, providing recommendations, support and intervention as needed for improvements, and meeting college and career ready graduation requirements.</p> <p>The quality of the mechanisms mentioned in the plan would be strengthened with additional details relating the applicant's approaches for provided training and support for high-need students, to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college and career standards or college and career ready graduation requirements.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants cite the use of facilities convenient and easily accessible for meetings and events. It is the intent of the applicant to provide teacher proficiency coaches for all districts for support and services they need. The details are not clear about the coaches and their value to teachers throughout implementation of this project. The plan lacks a high-quality plan to support the project implementation through policies and infrastructure that provides and ensure support and resources to the targeted participants.</p> <p>A general statement has been made that the participating schools are expected to retain their autonomy and flexibility within the implementation plan, but there are no details or description for how this will transpire.</p> <p>The plan states that students are able to demonstrate proficiency in a variety of ways and those who have demonstrated proficiency on standard based courses are able to move on to higher standards and courses or are offered enrichments based on individual academic interest. There is no existing plan mentioned for ensuring that progress and credit based on demonstrated mastery rather than the time spent on a topic is reflected. All of the participating schools are in the process of adopting additional time dedicated to interventions and enhancement, however, there is not enough information here to determine how the plan provides learning resources and instruction practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There are broad generalizations in this section with some specific reference to the participating students having access to personalized proficiency-based education, technology support, and use of formatted data systems, as a result of the grant. There is mention of parents, students and educators being provided multiple tools, including enhancements through hybrid learning and on-line curriculum, but minor descriptions about how technology support connects to academics and is appropriate and relevant to student learning. The applicant recommends that the LEA provides extra time and support for students who need it and additional challenges, opportunities and enhancements to show student proficiency on required standards, however, there is not enough information here to determine if new strategies and instructional practices constitute a high-quality plan intended to support infrastructure, resources and knowledge to result in appropriate and relevant student academic progress. It is unclear if or even how the mentioned online application data systems are actually interoperable and effectively used by the targeted population and for the intended purpose.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Reference is made to the project having measures to ensure that progress is regularly evaluated and adjustments for continuous improvement are made with timely feedback, including formative assessments. However, the statements are general with no reference to specific strategies being implemented that could ensure expected outcomes for monitoring, measuring and publically sharing information on program quality, results and funding by RTTT. The plan lacks specifics for implementing continuous improvement processes for professional development, technology and staff, and the impact on the project would strengthen this application.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that the district will ensure communication and engagement with the internal and external stakeholders, and the created grant position will facilitate completing all necessary evaluations and reporting requirements. The plan indicates that a Leadership teams at each school is dedicated to overseeing the implementation process, concerns and</p>		

opportunities for project improvements. The plan lacks provided specifics for the utilization of the grant administrator position, description of the duties or expectations of persons in the role for ensured ongoing communication and engagement, and does not have a clear and high-quality approaches to continuously improve its plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants have demonstrated a thoughtful process for implementing ambitious yet achievable performance measures by subgroups. It appears that the performance activities are measurable, however, the project lacks specifics throughout the plan to validate any overall goals and objectives. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how the targets are measurable and will provide needed information for proposed actions regarding implementation success or areas of concern and offered improvements over time. Additional could further explain the explanations and rational for the applicant-proposed performance measures that are selected and how the plan will review and improve performance measures progress over time, along with how measurements will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored for the plan.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan mentions having progress reports to be used as a part of the overall improvement process. Teachers and coaches are expected to evaluate quantitative and qualitative classroom data for discussions on progress, concerns, needed adjustments and opportunities for further improvements based on the Leadership Team and the performance measures. However, an effective project evaluation plan is not included in the narrative. It is not stated how the project will utilize the services of a third-party professional evaluator throughout the duration of the grant; if and when reports will be generated; types of data to be collected from all stakeholders; data used for reporting, such as state scores, educator evaluations, on-site observations, surveys, focus groups; and other specific information that evaluations will provide in regard to overall objectives of the plan. It is unclear how the annual summer in-services mentioned in the plan will effectively support implementation or is sufficient for supporting ongoing program adjustments and improvements.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget narrative request expects to support a multifaceted plan for coherent, replicable, and sustainable education reform. The budget identifies all funds expecting to support the project and supplies rational for each of the project-level budgets included in the plan. The use of the project budget narrative is not clear how it connects to the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal and the direct relationship to creating personalized learning environment for the targeted population. Throughout the application, the LEA expresses the desire to implement change in the districts and provide evidence of the commitment to improvements before, during and after the grant period end. However, it is not clear how this commitment will be fulfilled because of the limited explanations and focus on strategies that will ensure reasonable and sufficient to support development and implementation of the proposal. Throughout the application, the LEA expresses the desire to implement change in the districts and provide evidence of the commitment to improvements before, during and after the grant period ends, however, it is not clear how this commitment will be fulfilled because of the limited explanations of the focused strategies for supporting and the implementation of the proposal.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants plan for sustainability of the project goals beyond the grant period can include the implementation of established professional learning communities; the Leadership Teams contributions including implementation of activities, processes and strategies; evaluative tools for monitoring, measuring and sharing of information; technology implementation; feedbacks for adjustments and changes to project outcomes. The plan lacks details for financial sustainability of this project and support for the continuation beyond the five years. The high-quality plan for sustainability of the project goals is not included in the plan, which includes support from State and local government leaders and financial support. The plan lacks a substantiality budget for the three years after the term of the grant which describes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds to ensure that the project will be budget neutral by the conclusion of the five year period.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The lead applicant has a "Family Resource Center" (FRC) that provides services primarily to families who are homeless or living in poverty. The FRC is opened daily after school and on weekend and provides access to families and students for computer technology and counseling. One of the primary focuses of the FRC is the provision of parenting skills classes that provide for the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the parents and the children they are raising. This program is integrated in a partnership with the Oakridge Ministerial Society (OMS), and offers additional services such as: off campus counseling at no cost for students who are homeless or living in poverty; drug and alcohol counseling through referrals for students and parents at on a weekly basis; legal representation through Peer Court for delinquent and criminal behavior; and the Oakridge Food Share program to provide food for at risk families and students. These services are offered and provided in conjunction with the Oakridge School District in meeting the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the participating students.</p> <p>The WOPC has identified five population-level desired results tied to these ongoing public and private resource partnerships, with a preference toward improving outcomes for disadvantaged students. These desired results are aligned with and directly support the broader Race to the Top proposal. The population level educational or family community desired results for the population group are includes children entering kindergarten who are ready for school, children who are exiting third grade proficient in reading, and students graduating from high school, college and career ready.</p> <p>The applicant states that selected indicators will be tracked through the state required Achievement Compact reports and RTT-D grant effectiveness assessments, with both disaggregated and aggregated data that is readily available for analysis. The WOPC will use the data to target available partnership resources to student populations where they are needed most, with a special emphasis on improving results for student facing significant challenges, such as disabilities, homelessness, and poverty. The WOPC will also use data from performance measures to target students for relevant partnership interventions, and to seek out and build new partnerships where needed. Each year the WOPC will survey existing partnerships and explore new partnership opportunities according to existing needs. The plan states that these students will receive priority preference for partnership intervention and services.</p> <p>It is not clear how the project's collected data on relevant performance measures will still be readily available for all schools due to the Achievement Compacts required by the Oregon Department of Education. The plan provides for Leadership teams at all District schools to benefit directly from these partnerships, however, the plan does not clearly describe, since this data is required throughout Oregon, exactly how the leadership teams throughout the state will be able to use the WOPC partnership model to improve results for students and families in their communities.</p> <p>The plan has decision making processes in place to select, implement, and evaluate community partnerships and support, however, the plan failed to elaborate on these processes with details to ensure the intended results, (effective performance measures of growth; review of participation rates; effectiveness of the partnerships). The proposal fails to clearly explain how the partnerships will integrate education and other services for participating students and the tools that will be employed. The applicants states that they will engage parents and families through community forums, which are intended to supply comments and action plans actively available for discussion and evaluation by participants. The plan lacks plans for ensuring effectiveness of these partnerships, and what specifics are needed to review measures for community input, influences and decisions of the local school boards, and the administrative team leadership, for decision-making and guaranteeing increased student achievement and well being.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has specified that their plan will build on its work in a multifaceted plan, changing the face of education, creating a personalized learning environment, accelerating student achievement across the board and deepening student learning with individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. The vision of the plan's proficiency-based teaching and learning improvements are stated to be implemented for anticipated system change. The innovative challenges are expected to occur by advancing students solely on the basis of achievement and proficiency in all content areas and moving teachers towards a data backed, proficiency based model of education. The plan intends to use three distinct levels, but these levels are not clearly defined in the plan, for approaching the implementation of the proficiency-based model, which aligns with personalized support in common and individual task that are based on student academic interest. Furthermore, the plan lacks detailed personalization of strategies for creating a personalized learning environment; tools for accelerating student achievement across the board; and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college and career ready standards and graduation requirements. There are limited strategies included in the plan for deepening student learning with individual task that are the bases for meeting the needs of each student and ensuring academic improvements.

Total	210	109
-------	-----	-----